UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/577,178 | 04/26/2006 | Christina Mertens | 1-2003.020 US | 3452 | |
| ²⁴²⁴⁷ TRASKBRITT. | 7590 11/04/200 , P.C. | EXAMINER | | | |
| P.O. BOX 2550 |) | BAEK, BONG-SOOK | | | |
| SALI LAKE C | TITY, UT 84110 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1614 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 11/04/2009 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTOMail@traskbritt.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/577,178 | MERTENS ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| BONG-SOOK BAEK | 1614 | | |

| | | BONG-SOOK BAEK | 1614 | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REF | PLY FILED <u>19 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | R ALLOWANCE. | |
| app app for | e reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on plication, applicant must timely file one of the following polication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Ciods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavir eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) 🔲 b) 🛚 | The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejection | in. |
| have beer under 37 (set forth ir may reduc | s of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the solution (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later are any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The filin No | e Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp g the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter tice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| AMENDI | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | |
| (a) (b) | ne proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be they raise new issues that would require further cor they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below They are not deemed to place the application in bet | nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); | ΓE below); | |
| (0) | appeal; and/or | ter form for appear by materially rec | adding of Simplifying th | 16 133463 101 |
| (d) | They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| | NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1) | 16 and 41.33(a)). | | |
| | e amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| | oplicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | |
| nor | ewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all n-allowable claim(s). | | _ | |
| hov The | r purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) withe new or amended claims would be rejected is prove e status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: wim(s) allowed: | | l be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| Cla Cla | im(s) objected to: im(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . im(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| | /IT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| bed was | e affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but cause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and s not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | I sufficient reasons why the affidavi | t or other evidence is | necessary and |
| ent sho | e affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing ered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to obwing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | s to provide a). |
| | ne affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation ST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | itry is below or attach | ea. |
| | ne request for reconsideration has been considered but ee Continuation Sheet. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| | ote the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (ther: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| | | /Brian-Yong S Kwon/ Primary Examiner, Art U | nit 1614 | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The added limitation (prior to exposure of the animal to ticks) in the claims requires further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not found to be persuasive for reason of record and the following: In response to the argument that Willis does not describe administereing a haloarylpyrazole to an animal prior to exposure of the animal to ticks, the argument is directed to the amended claims, which is not entered, thus the argument is not relevant. In response to the argument that the specification clearly define "deterring" by the example, the example is not cosidered as a definition of the word "deterring", but a preferablel embodiment, thus the broadest reasonable interpretation of "deterring", which means preventing or inhibiting according to the definition of Merriam-Webster oline dictionary, is still applied. Therefore, combating or killing ticks as taught by Willis reads on "deterring". In the alternative, the reference teaches the use of the same compound for combating ticks in the animal infested or liable to be infested therewith (animal not yet infested by ticks), thus the deterring effect as Applicants argued necessarily occurs when an animal liable to be infested with ticks is treated for combating ticks as taught by Willis. Even in the animal already infested with ticks, the treatment as taught by Willis necessarily deters attachment and feeding of additional ticks. Therefore, the claims are sill anticipated by Willis or obvious over the reference.